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Reviewer's report:


This study reviewed the feasibility, efficacy, and complications of OTSC system for management of acute non-variceal upper GI bleeding. The following comments are for the reference of authors:

Major comments
1. Please provide an explicit statement regarding participants, interventions, comparisons, and outcomes (PICO) for this topic.
2. Did this manuscript have systematic review registration number?
3. Please provide search strategy. Whether did the authors use MeSH terms and All Fields to search gastrointestinal bleeding and OTSC? Whether did the authors use "gastrointestinal hemorrhage," "hematemesis," "melena," or "peptic ulcer hemorrhage" to search the relevant studies?
4. Whether were "OTSC" and "over the scope clip" enough to search the relevant studies?
5. Figure 2 showed the proportion of acute upper non-variceal gastrointestinal bleeding etiologies. The etiologies are various. The risks of recurrent bleeding are different between these etiologies. For the concern of risk of bias, whether was the population that was intended to be sampled representative?
6. Regarding "Criteria for inclusion and exclusion" (Page 4), the authors reported that "Re-bleeding was diagnosed if a retreatment of the target lesion was required after initial successful endoscopic treatment." It is different from what we know about the definition of re-bleeding. In fact, clinical re-bleeding is diagnosed if persistent tarry stool passage with tachycardia, shock, or the hemoglobin level drop. Please explain why the authors made the definition.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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